UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/533,083	04/28/2005	Thuy-Phuong Le	2002P03505WOUS	2307	
28524 SIEMENS COF	7590 03/24/200 <b>RPORATION</b>	EXAMINER			
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 170 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH			NILANONT, YOUPAPORN		
ISELIN, NJ 088		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			2446		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/24/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/533,083	LE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
	AILOIIIL	

	YOUPAPORN NILANONT	·	2446	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet wit	th the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>05 March 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION	N FOR A	ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or capplication, applicant must timely file one of the followin application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 periods:	g replies: (1) an amendment, a peal (with appeal fee) in comp	affidavit oliance v	, or other evidence, w vith 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailib) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) of MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.0	Advisory Action, or (2) the date so later than SIX MONTHS from the r (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHI	e mailing	date of the final rejectio	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of eunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office lat may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(NOTICE OF APPEAL	extension and the corresponding a eshortened statutory period for re er than three months after the mai	amount o ply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	te extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in con filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any ext Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37	'(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection  (a) They raise new issues that would require further of  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE be  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or  (d) They present additional claims without canceling a	onsideration and/or search (se low); etter form for appeal by materi	ee NOT ially red	E below); ucing or simplifying th	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a) 4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1. 5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(section). 6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be non-allowable claim(s).	). 121. See attached Notice of N s):	lon-Con	npliant Amendment (F	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pr The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: None. Claim(s) objected to: None. Claim(s) rejected: 8-23. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.		⊠ will	be entered and an ex	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good a was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filin entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar</li> </ol>	overcome all rejections under	r appeal	l and/or appellant fails	to provide a
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanat REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered to the considered to th</li></ol>			•	
see Continuation Sheet.  12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)			condition for alloward	se because.
13.  Other:				
/Jeffrey Pwu/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2446				

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

With respect to art rejection, applicants argue that the SGI reference provides for a tunnel between workstations in different networks but does not disclose that the tunnel is used exclusively by the two workstations. However, examiner maintains the rejection.

The SGI reference is used in the rejection because it does teach that creating tunnel between workstations in different networks through

router(s) does exist at the time the invention was made. Furthermore, it is commonly known in the art that the purpose of creating a tunnel is to create virtually private communication channel between the two communicating parties or endpoints as previously stated in the Final Action, and thus, SGI reference, which shows a tunnel between a Host in Network A and a Host in Network C, does teach the private or 'exclusive use' of the tunnel between the two hosts.

Additionally, the applicants argue that the relied on Legacy network systems is used to show that "prior systems have used both element a and element b" cited in the argument and that the examiner must show prior art of record to support the rejection. However, it has been the examiner's position that the Legacy network systems is mentioned as a reason to combine the teachings of Chiles reference and the SGI reference together because the Legacy network systems is commonly known in the art at the time of the invention to require unique address for each device in the system and direct tunneling between them in order to communicate. Thus, because such systems are still in use at the time the invention, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the need to include SGI direct tunneling between two communicating hosts to provide support for older systems called Legacy network systems in additional to the teaching of Chiles reference. Therefore, the examiner maintains the rejection.